



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,446	03/26/2004	Dieter Brueckner	Q79459	8132
23373	7590	02/06/2008	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			VERDI, KIMBLEANN C	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2194				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/06/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

8

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/809,446	BRUECKNER ET AL.
	Examiner KimbleAnn Verdi	Art Unit 2194

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) KimbleAnn Verdi. (3) _____.

(2) Allison Tulino (48294). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 14 January 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: N/A.

Identification of prior art discussed: N/A.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's attorney argued the examiner was incorrect in not considering the Einchip-Controller Fuer Das Sercos-Interface, Integrierte Echtzeit-Kommunikation Fuer Die MSR-Technik" by Kiel et al. as noted on the submitted International Search Report and submitted on the IDS. Primary Examiner Van H. Nguyen agreed with Applicant's attorney's arguments. Examiner has considered the non patent literature.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


WILLIAM THOMSON
EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required